



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. III.—1. *Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley; comprising Observations on its Mineral Geography, Internal Resources, and Aboriginal Population.* By HENRY R. SCHOOLCRAFT. New York. 1825. 8vo. pp. 459.

2. *A Vindication of the Rev. Mr Heckewelder's History of the Indian Nations.* By WILLIAM RAWLE. [Read at a Meeting of the Council of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, February 15, 1826, and published in the Second Part of the First Volume of their Memoirs.]

MR SCHOOLCRAFT is advantageously known to the literary community as an accurate and judicious observer and an enterprising traveller. His researches have been directed to the works of nature, and to man, where man has little besides the physical faculties which nature has given him. Mr Schoolcraft has traversed the immense trans-Allegany regions, whose geographical features present an aspect of magnitude and solitary grandeur, impressive, and almost overpowering. There the lakes and rivers, the forests and prairies, are formed on a gigantic scale, still stretching before the eye of the traveller, like the distant horizon, which may be followed, but never approached. Within the memory of the present generation, this vast plain, extending from the barriers of the Atlantic to those of the Pacific, was the home of the red man, and of the animals which ministered to his subsistence and comfort; and even now, notwithstanding its population of two millions, the portion reclaimed by the hand of civilization is scarcely visible on the vast panorama, which it presents.

In following the relations of travellers through these regions, we are carried back to the days of La Salle and Hennepin. In all but the uncertainty before them, and the perils around them, the great features of the landscape are unchanged. There is yet a freshness in the birch canoe, and in the songs of the *voyageurs*, which time has not impaired, and they are associated with all our notions of a northwest journey.

Mr Schoolcraft was appointed secretary to the commissioners, who negotiated the treaty of Chicago in 1821, and he accompanied one of them from Detroit to that place. Most of the journey was performed in a birch canoe, and the travellers crossed the western arm of Lake Erie, and ascended the

Maumee to Fort Wayne, near its source. Here they passed the height of land, and embarking upon the Wabash, descended that river to its mouth. They then traversed the state of Illinois, and reëmbarking in their frail vessel at St Louis, ascended the Illinois river to the Rapids, where they abandoned the water and travelled over the vast *steppes*, which intervene between that spot and Chicago. The incidents and reflections which occurred on the journey, together with the circumstances attending the progress of the treaty, form the subject of Mr Schoolcraft's work.

Mr Schoolcraft, in a former work, directed the attention of geologists to the western regions of this country, and he is the first author in the United States, who has published a detailed account of a mining district. His 'View of the Lead Mines of Missouri' has been for some years before the public, and it excited expectations, which subsequent events have fully justified. Some of the peculiar opinions advanced in the work require confirmation, and the arrangement of the facts is injudicious. But it evinces a precision and accuracy in its details, and a power of observation, which will render it valuable as a permanent book of reference. Mr Schoolcraft's 'Narrative Journal of Travels' has been already examined in a former number of this Review, and we shall therefore pass without further introduction to the work, whose title is placed first at the head of our article.

This author is among the numerous examples, which our country has afforded, of individuals, who have made their way to distinction, without any adventitious aid. We have understood, that his education was limited, and that he has been the architect of his own fortune. There is a visible improvement in his successive works, creditable to his judgment and application. In his 'View of the Lead Mines' there was little of the tact of authorship; while in his more recent book the style is clear, the diction pure, and the arrangement happy. There is however, at times, an evident search after words, not always sanctioned by the best usage. Mr Schoolcraft should recollect, that he will express himself most forcibly, when he expresses himself most easily.

The route, which our traveller followed, presented scenes and incidents, and gave rise to recollections and anticipations, of which he has availed himself. The interest of the narrative is unbroken.

The daring character of General Wayne, the 'Mad Anthony' of the revolutionary war, is happily illustrated by an anecdote related by Mr Schoolcraft, in his description of the ruins of Fort Maumee.

'When General Wayne arrived before this work, after his victory over the Indians at Presque Isle, he caused a general destruction and devastation of the buildings and improvements for a considerable distance, both above and below the fort. Some of the buildings were within pistol shot of the garrison, who remained silent spectators of this scene. Small parties of the American troops frequently went so near the works as to enter into conversation with the sentinels on the walls. Nor did General Wayne himself shrink from a similar exposure. There is a copious spring of pellucid water situated near one of the angles of this work. Conversations held at this spring could be clearly understood within the fort. Here General Wayne, after riding round the works, halted with his attendants, and maintained, for some minutes, a familiar conversation on the events of the campaign. Those who know his enthusiastic character, need not be told that he made use of several very pointed expressions. The General dismounted, took off his hat, and drank from the spring.'

Mr Schoolcraft's historical notices of the military expeditions, which have at various times penetrated the country intersected by his route, are interesting; and many new facts, illustrative of the causes of their success or disasters have been gleaned by him from tradition, or from cotemporary accounts. He does justice, and only justice, to General St Clair, whose misfortune it was, to be twice placed in situations, from which neither talents nor intrepidity could rescue him. He was the victim of public opinion, but a military tribunal, in both cases, honorably acquitted him, and history has confirmed the sentence.

'Notwithstanding these ingenuous statements,' (alluding to the official report of the unfortunate commander), 'General St Clair is said to have brought off his men in tolerable order, with most of the wounded. During the action he had himself many narrow escapes; eight balls having passed through his clothes. The attack was conducted with astonishing intrepidity on the part of the Indians. After giving one fire, they rushed on, tomahawk in hand.'

In this campaign, as well as in that of Harmer, the result was not justly attributable to any imbecility on the part of the commanding general. The situation of the government ren-

dered it necessary, that both expeditions should move with all possible celerity. The troops were undisciplined, their physical and moral qualities were bad, and the theatre of operations was so distant from the places of supply, that the *matériel* of each army was wretchedly deficient. It is matter of surprise, not that they were discomfited, but that they penetrated so far, and that any portion of them returned.

We have seldom met with a more spirited sketch, than the following description of a scene upon the Maumee, and it is equally faithful and animated.

‘The river has its course through a heavy forest of trees, clothed with a profuse foliage, some of which overhang the water, and others, riven from their very tops by strokes of lightning, project their bleached and denuded limbs amid the greenest foliage. When we throw over a scene like this, the strong and deep lights and shadows of the living landscape, with its most minute objects reflected in the clear mirror of the stream; with here and there a small log cabin on shore, surrounded with a few cattle; and the whole enlivened by the occasional flight of land birds, or the sudden flapping of a flock of ducks on the water, a pretty correct idea will be formed of a morning’s voyage upon this broad and clear stream.’

Our author omits no opportunity of investigating, and of investigating well, all subjects connected with his favorite studies. In the thirteenth chapter he adverts to his previous publications on the mines, and describes in a clear and methodical manner, the principal formations of limestone, sandstone, and granite, of which latter mineral, an insulated field is found in the mining district. He also devotes some attention, and it could not have been better devoted, to the consideration of the metalliferous marl or clay, which has thus far been found the principal repository of the galena of that region; and points out the distinction between this substance and the diluvial clay or gravel; the latter of which forms the upper series of the various deposits. This singular feature in the position of the Missouri lead demands further investigation. The only analogous fact we recollect, is that recorded by Professor Buckland, as occurring in the vale of Clwydd in North Wales; but this is not in exact coincidence, as the lead ore mentioned by Buckland exists in the form of pebbles in a bed of ‘diluvial gravel,’ very much in the manner of the stream tin ore in Cornwall.

The oldest species of limestone (to speak in accordance

with the doctrines of the Wernerian school) which Mr Schoolcraft found in the mining district, he denominates 'inferior,' arranging it with the transition, and not with the primitive class of limestone, to which latter he had previously referred it in his 'View of the Lead Mines.' Other corrections in the details of his former descriptions are made, for which we have not room.

Some just observations are introduced respecting the importance of the proposed canal from Chicago to the Illinois, and on the nature of the country, and the difficulties to be surmounted. There is not perhaps on the globe a spot, where such a mighty physical revolution could be produced with so little human labor, as by opening a communication between Lake Michigan and some of the upper tributaries of the Illinois. The Des Pleines, which is a considerable stream, rises in the country between the Mississippi and Lake Michigan, and pursuing a southeasterly course, approaches within twelve miles of the lake. The intermediate land is a level prairie, stretching in every direction, as far as the eye can reach. Its extreme elevation above the surface of the lake is seventeen feet, and that feeble barrier is all that is interposed between this mighty mass of water and the rich valley of the Mississippi, which it overhangs, like an avalanche on the summit of the Alps. It would be a matter of curious speculation to calculate the consequences of turning to the Gulf of Mexico one of those immense reservoirs, which are the fountains of the St Lawrence. The Delta of the Mississippi would be inundated and destroyed, and its low bottoms overflowed by a deluge, whose extent and duration no man can estimate. A gradual diminution would take place in the waters of Lake Michigan, which would be felt in Huron and Erie, and Chicago would present some of the imposing features of the entrance into the Niagara river.

It has long been known that boats can pass by water from the Illinois to Lake Michigan, but we have never seen a satisfactory explication of this singular fact; and as it has fallen to our lot to make this voyage, and to pass a night in a birch canoe upon the great Saganashkee marsh, through which the route passes, and that too with the *pleasant* accompaniments of intense heat, a violent thunder storm, and swarms of musquitoes, such as are known only to those who have traversed the western forests, we shall briefly recall our impres-

sions of the scene. Between the Des Pleines and Lake Michigan, but east of the Portage path, there is an extensive marsh, to which we have just alluded. In a wet season it assumes the appearance of a lake, almost covered with the large water lily, whose yellow flowers and broad leaves overspread the surface, so that it would be difficult for a boat, without a skilful pilot, to find her way through it. This lake generally discharges itself into the Des Pleines, but when that river is high, its waters fill the channel of communication and flow into the lake. The *voyageur* enters this channel, and follows the track made by some other boat, or works his own way, slowly and laboriously. As he approaches the natural termination of the marsh, the water becomes more and more shallow, and his progress more and more difficult. He at length arrives at the boundary, and finds himself at the summit level of the country. An inclined plane of seven miles in extent, and with a depression of seventeen feet, stretches between him and Lake Michigan. And we very much doubt, whether the water of the Des Pleines ever surmounted this summit level and mingled with the Chicago, until this route had been frequently passed. The communication at present existing, has apparently been effected in a long course of years, by drawing the boats through the mud at the extremity of the marsh, and thus forming a small channel, which is soon increased by the velocity of the current, occasioned by the rapid descent of the country toward the lake. This channel is called the Rigolet, and bears every appearance of the origin we have assigned to it. A boat descends it with great rapidity, and about two miles from the marsh enters the Chicago creek, a deep and sluggish stream, at this point on a level with the lake.

In some cursory remarks upon the large mounds in the vicinity of St Louis, Mr Schoolcraft justly observes, that 'enough has certainly been written on the subject of our mounds, to prove how little we know, either of their origin, or of their interior structure.' These remains of ancient art have attracted the attention of travellers since the first settlement of the country; and standing as they do, the sole monuments of human industry, amid interminable forests, it is not surprising, that curiosity should be busy in investigating the age and objects of their founders. But little, however, has been effected to satisfy the rational inquirer, and before much progress can be made, all the facts connected with the topographical situa-

tion and construction of these works, and with the remains of earthen and metallic instruments found in and about them, should be collected and preserved. The Reverend Isaac McCoy, the Principal of the Missionary Establishment upon the St Joseph of Lake Michigan, a man of sound judgment and rigid integrity, has observed a class of works in that country, differing essentially from any which have been elsewhere found. As his account of them is interesting, we shall transcribe the letter he has addressed to us.

‘Aware of the interest you feel in everything relating to the character and condition of the Aborigines of our country, I do myself the pleasure to enclose to you a plot of a tract of land, which has been cultivated in an unusual manner for this country, and which was abandoned by its cultivators ages ago.

‘These marks of antiquity are peculiarly interesting, because they exhibit the work of civilized, and not of savage, man. All, or nearly all, the other works of antiquity, which have been found in these western regions, convince the observer, that they were formed by men, who had made little or no advance in the arts. If we examine a number of mounds in the same neighborhood, we find them situated without any regard to order in the arrangement, precisely as modern savages place the huts in their villages, and plant the corn in their fields. If we observe a fortification made of earth, we shall find it exhibits no greater order in its formation, than necessity in a similar case would suggest to an uncultivated Indian of modern days. If it be a wall of stone, the stones are unbroken, as they were taken from the quarry, or rather from the neighboring brook or river.

‘In the works, to which I now allude, we find what we suppose to have been garden spots, thrown into ridges and walks with so much judgment, good order, and taste in the arrangement, as to forbid a thought, that they were formed by uncivilized man. The plans sent you, by no means represent the most striking works. I procured these, because the places were near my residence. I can find several acres together, laid out into walks and beds, in a style which would not suffer by a comparison with any gardens in the United States.

‘These places were not cultivated by the early French emigrants to the country, because,

‘1. They evince a population at least twenty times greater than the French ever had in any of the regions of the lakes in

those early times. In the tract of country, in which I have observed them, of one hundred and fifty miles in extent, north and south, from Grand River to the Elksheart, I think the number and extent of these ancient improvements indicate a population nearly or quite equal in density to that of Indiana.

‘2. The early French establishments were generally made on navigable streams. But these improvements are spread over the whole country. Scarcely a fertile prairie is found, on the margin of which we do not observe these evidences of civilization.

‘3. These works were abandoned by their proprietors long before the country became known to the Europeans. The timber, standing, fallen, and decaying, on these cultivated spots, has precisely the same appearance in respect to age, as that immediately adjoining. On a cluster of these beds, a plan of which I send you, I cut down a white-oak tree, which measured three feet two inches in diameter two and a half feet above the ground, and which was three hundred and twenty-five years old, if the real age of a tree is indicated by the number of its concentric circles.

‘From the indications yet remaining, it is certain that most of these works have disappeared. We find none in the beech, ash, or walnut land, because here the earth is loose and mellow to the surface, and not bound with grass. We find them rarely in the prairies far from the timber, because the places of which I speak have been, as I suppose, not fields, but gardens, convenient to dwellinghouses, which were probably placed in the vicinity of the timber for the same reasons which induce our present settlers to select similar sites for their residence. In what we call barrens, adjoining prairies, the surface of the earth is bound by the grass, in the same manner as that of the prairie itself, and by these means the ridges are preserved. And notwithstanding the causes which are in daily operation to destroy these works, I am confident I have seen acres of them which will exist for centuries, if assailed by no other hand than that of nature. The Indians of Grand River informed me, that these appearances are found on all the waters of that river, and that they extend south upon the waters of the Kekalimazoo. A few are found near Michillimackinac. To use their expression, “the country is full of them.”

‘The Indian tradition on this subject is, that these places were cultivated by a race of men, whom they denominate

Prairie Indians, and that they were driven from the country by the united tribes of Chippewas, Ottawas, and Potawatomes. The few who survived the calamities of war, went westward, and some may even yet exist beyond the Mississippi. But not the smallest reliance can be placed on any Indian tradition relating to a remote period.'

The remarkable impressions in the limestone rock in the vicinity of Saint Louis, have attracted the attention of this author. Their formation seems to be doubtful. While Mr Schoolcraft attributes it to the actual contact of the living member with the material of the rock before its induration; Colonel Benton, in a note annexed to the account, supposes that these impressions were produced by human labor. They are certainly curious relics, whether of nature or art. We understand, they have been found in various places in Missouri, and exhibiting different parts and postures of the human body. The resemblance in all is said to be perfect, and it undoubtedly is so in those we have seen. Even the muscular parts of the feet are distinctly shown; and if they are the work of the chisel, they evince a state of the arts, in ages long gone by, of which no other monument has survived. Colonel Benton has stated the difficulties attending either hypothesis, and although we are inclined to differ from him in his conclusions respecting the origin of these remains, yet our confidence in his judgment induces us to doubt, and await the result of farther investigation, for which we know of no one better qualified than that gentleman.

Our general impressions concerning Mr Schoolcraft's work may be collected from the preceding observations. It abounds in accurate and animated descriptions, and in just and philosophical reflections. There is a reach of thought pervading it, and evidence of powers of research, alike creditable to the author and satisfactory to the reader. The region he traversed and describes, is one of the most important and interesting in all the elements of future power and productiveness, which our wide spread country offers to those, who look forward with solicitude to her destiny. Mr Schoolcraft has placed this region before us, with its forests and prairies, its rivers and lakes, its animate and inanimate kingdoms, and he has described and lamented the decline and fall of its former possessors, and the exterminating march of those who are succeeding to them.

The various notices of the Indians interspersed through this volume must constitute its principal charm with the general reader. Mr Schoolcraft enjoyed favorable opportunities for investigating the character and condition of these people, and he has surveyed them with the eyes of a cautious and judicious observer. He has avoided the extremes of reproach and panegyric, and has seen and described them as they are. It is certainly important, that a correct estimate should be formed of the situation and prospects of our aboriginal neighbors. It is important in relation to our general knowledge of the human family. And it is still more important in its application to the great moral problem, whose solution attracts the attention of the American government and people, and upon which must depend the renovation or extinction of this devoted race.

Among the best known works on this subject is that of Mr Heckewelder, and the observations of Mr Rawle afford us an opportunity, at this time, of investigating his character as a judicious and faithful historian. Those who have followed the progress of opinion on subjects connected with the Indians, are well aware, that almost all the previous writers, English or French, who have recorded their own observations, or collected those of others, have described these people, as possessing the ordinary proportion of virtues and vices, which accompany human nature in its uncultivated state. The sketch was sometimes brighter, and sometimes darker, deriving its color from accidental circumstances, and perhaps from the constitutional temperament of the artist. But the general outline was faithful, and the world was content to believe, that moral and physical evil was found in the American forests, as well as in every other region, occupied by any branch of the dispersed family of man.

But it was reserved for Mr Heckewelder to introduce a new era into our knowledge of these subjects. He has surveyed the character and manners and former situation of our aboriginal inhabitants under a bright and glowing light. His account is a pure, unmixed panegyric. The most idle traditions of the Indians, with him become sober history; their superstition is religion; their indolence philosophical indifference or pious resignation; their astonishing improvidence, hospitality; and many other defects in their character, are converted into the corresponding virtues. And Mr Rawle is not the only respectable writer, who has been deceived by these partial representations. No one can look upon the passing literature of the day, without

being sensible of the effect on the public mind, which has been produced by this worthy old missionary. His favorite tribe, the Lenni Lenape, constitute the very *beau idéal* of a perfect savage. The great Indian family, however widely dispersed, is brought to this Delaware standard, and the *plastic* materials in the possession of Mr Heckewelder have enabled him to produce a uniform appearance, for which we shall vainly seek a prototype in nature. Many, and no doubt sincere regrets, have been expressed at that masterstroke of policy, by which the Iroquois persuaded the Delawares, that they were too fierce and powerful for men, and ought to assume the dress and duties of women; and then, by some magic spell, prevented them from resuming their pristine employment. And notwithstanding the commentary of Mr Rawle upon these and other traditions recorded by Mr Heckewelder, we shall find, that the character of this author for sound, discriminating judgment, is not redeemed from previous impressions. Mr Rawle conceives that Mr Heckewelder is not responsible for these stories, because he relates them as traditions. And he then observes, that the ‘author who professes to give an account of the history of a nation among whom he has resided, would perform his part imperfectly if he disregarded their own traditions.’ All this is well, but it leaves untouched the only real topic of inquiry. This is, not whether Mr Heckewelder has recorded Indian traditions, but whether he has recorded them as grave facts to which he assented himself, and to which he was desirous of procuring the assent of his readers. If these traditions are inconsistent with other and more authentic sources of information, or if they are incompatible with acknowledged principles of human nature, we may safely refer their origin to similar circumstances with those, which have elsewhere led to so much fabulous history. The slightest examination will show, that there is a spirit of credulity in the narrative of these legends, utterly irreconcilable with the cautious deliberation of an historian. No Delaware could relate them with a graver manner, nor with a firmer conviction of their truth. Nor is it probable that any one could be found, more anxious to impress this conviction upon others. The subject occupies more than twenty pages of Mr Heckewelder’s work, and that it is discussed *con amore* is evident from the most cursory examination. If any one will read from the twenty-eighth to the fifty-fourth page of that book, he will find the most idle tales gravely

related, and a sympathy displayed for the fallen fortunes of the Delawares, which leaves no doubt of the author's sincerity.

Mr Heckewelder's work comprises a series of chapters, and the letters which passed between himself and Mr Duponceau. The first part of the former is devoted to the history and traditions of the Delawares, and the latter to philological investigations. The manners and customs and condition of these Indians occupy the residue of the work. As the object we have now in view, is merely to ascertain the claims of this author to the confidence of his readers, we shall here confine our examination to his picture of Indian society. This branch of the subject occupies thirty-nine chapters. To place in a more striking point of view the total absence of all just discrimination, and the strain of panegyric in which the author indulges, we shall give his own synopsis of these chapters, and the commencement of a part of them. Our readers can then judge for themselves how far they are prepared to adopt the 'new views' of a writer, whose prejudices present themselves in such bold relief.

The five first chapters are historical. The sixth treats of *The General Character of the Indians*. It thus commences ;

'The Indian considers himself as a being created by an all powerful, wise, and benevolent Mannito ; all that he possesses, all that he enjoys, he looks upon as given to him, or allotted for his use by the Great Spirit, who gave him life ; he therefore believes it to be his duty to adore and worship his creator and benefactor ; to acknowledge with gratitude his past favors, thank him for present blessings, and solicit the continuance of his good will.'

'VII. *Government.*

'Although the Indians have no code of laws for their government, the chiefs find little or no difficulty in governing them. They are supported by able, experienced counsellors, men who study the welfare of the nation,' &c.

'VIII. *Education.*

'It may justly be a subject of wonder, how a nation without a written code of laws or a system of jurisprudence, without any form or constitution of government, and without even a single elective or hereditary magistracy can subsist together in peace and harmony, and in the exercise of the moral virtues.'

'XI. *Oratory.*

'The eloquence of the Indians is natural and simple ; they speak what their feelings dictate without art and without rule ;

their speeches are forcible and impressive, their arguments few and pointed, and when they mean to persuade, as well as convince, they take the shortest way to reach the heart.'

'XIV. *Intercourse with each other.*

'It is a striking fact, that the Indians in their uncivilized state should so behave towards each other, as though they were a civilized people.'

'XV. *Political Manœuvres.*

'In the management of their national affairs, the Indians display as much skill and dexterity, perhaps, as any people upon earth.'

'XVI. *Marriage and Treatment of their Wives.*

'There are many people who believe, from the labor that they see the Indian women perform, that they are in a manner treated as slaves. These labors are hard indeed, compared with the tasks imposed upon females in civilized society; but they are no more than their fair share, under every consideration and due allowance of the hardships attendant on savage life. Therefore they are not only voluntarily but cheerfully submitted to,' &c.*

'XVII. *Respect for the Age.*

'There is no nation in the world, who pay greater respect to old age than the American Indians.'

'XVIII. *Pride and Greatness of Soul.*

'The Indians are proud, but not vain; they consider vanity as degrading, and unworthy the character of a man.'

'XIX. *Wars, and the Causes which lead to them.*

'It is a fixed principle with the Indians, that evil cannot come out of good, that no friend will injure a friend,' &c.

'XX. *Manner of surprising their Enemies.*

'Courage, art, and circumspection are the essential and indispensable qualifications of an Indian warrior.'

'XXI. *Peace Messengers.*

'While the American Indians remained in the free and undisturbed possession of the land which God gave to them, and even for a long time after the Europeans had settled themselves in their

* Of all the astonishing mistakes made by Mr Heckewelder, there is none which displays greater ignorance of the subject than this. The life of an Indian woman is a life of labor, and servitude, and fear. She is considered as an inferior being, made to work for her family and to obey her husband. And every person, who has resided a single day in an Indian camp, must be aware of the brutality, with which the women are treated.

country, there was no people upon earth, who paid a more religious respect than they did, to the sacred character of ambassadors.'

'XXII. *Treaties.*

'In early times, when Indian nations, after long and bloody wars, met together for the purpose of adjusting their difference, or concluding a peace with each other, it was their laudable custom, as a token of their sincerity, to remove out of the place where the peacemakers were sitting all warlike weapons and instruments of destruction, &c. "For," said they, "when we are engaged in a good work, nothing that is bad must be visible. We are met together to forgive and forget,"' &c.

'XXIII. *General Observations of the Indians on the White People.*

'The Indians believe that the whites were made by the same Great Spirit who created them,' &c. 'They will not admit that the whites are superior beings,' &c. 'But that they [the Indians] have no need of any such book, to let them know the will of their maker; they find it engraved on their own hearts,' &c.

'XXVI. *Dances, Songs, Sacrifices.*

'The dances of the Indians vary according to the purposes for which they are intended.' 'It is a pleasing spectacle to see the Indian dances when intended merely for social diversion and innocent amusement. I acknowledge, I would prefer being present at them for a full hour, than a few minutes only at such dances as I have witnessed in our country towns,' &c.

'XXX. *Physicians and Surgeons.*

'By these names I mean to distinguish the good and honest practitioners,' &c. 'With this only exception, the Indian physicians are perhaps more free from fanciful theories, than those of any other nation upon earth.'

'XXXII. *Superstition.*

'Great and powerful as the Indian conceives himself to be, firm and undaunted as he really is, braving all seasons and weathers, patient of hunger, careless of danger, fond of displaying the native energy,' &c.

'XXXVIII. *Friendship.*

'Those who believe that no faith is to be placed in the friendship of an Indian, are egregiously mistaken, and know very little of the true character of these men of nature.'

'XLIV. *The Indians and the Whites compared.*

'If lions had painters!' We need not quote from this chapter. It contains the quintessence of all that precede it.

The other chapters of this work embrace topics not readily admitting these encomiastic introductions. They relate principally, though not altogether, to the physical condition of the Indians, and to those arbitrary customs, which have no connexion with the moral qualities of a people. These are; 'Computation of Time;' 'Preachers and Prophets;' 'Funerals;' 'Drunkenness;' 'Insanity;' 'Suicide;' 'Initiation of Boys;' 'Doctors and Jugglers;' 'Bodily Constitution and Diseases;' 'Scalping, Whoops, &c.;' 'Dress, &c.;' 'Food and Cookery.'

Let it be recollected, that the quotations here made, are not selected for the purpose of exhibiting the peculiar views of the author, but that they are his own leading observations, introducing the various topics he proposes to examine and discuss. And with these facts in view, our readers may well coincide in sentiment with Mr Rawle, when he says, that 'He,' Mr Heckewelder, 'presented to us some new views of the Indian character,' however they may differ from him in his opinion, that 'the whole account of them was conveyed in a manner so plain and unaffected, with such evident *candor* and apparent *accuracy*, that conviction generally, if not universally, followed.' Mr Rawle's character is deservedly high, but in these observations he does not appear to us to have displayed his accustomed powers of discrimination, nor the acumen of his profession.

We protest with equal earnestness and sincerity against any construction of our language which would impute to us a design to throw the slightest doubt upon the moral qualities of Mr Heckewelder. He has gone, where our praise and censure are equally worthless to him; but we shall say of him what we knew of him, that in the integrity of his purposes, in the blamelessness of his life and conversation, and in his devotion to the great objects before him, he approached the models of the primitive ages. We say this, because the spirit of our observations on a former occasion has been misunderstood, and because we disclaim all intentions of disparaging the memory of this venerable man, by whomsoever such a design may be imputed to us.

But Mr Heckewelder's work is a part of the general stock of literature, open to examination, and from the nature of its topics, inviting it. That various opinions should prevail, concerning its merit and fidelity, ought to have been anticipated; particularly as the author 'has impressed us,' in the language

of Mr Rawle, 'with the belief, that these people were still more acute, more politic, and in some respect more refined than had been generally understood.' And if, on the first appearance of the work, its statements and conclusions were not called in question, Mr Rawle will find the true reason in the subject itself, of which few had any personal knowledge, and not in a general acquiescence in its doctrines and details among those qualified to estimate them. We well know the impression produced by it upon the minds of many, who are conversant with these matters; and in stating our own opinion, we state the opinions of persons competent to form one on the subject, that as a record of Indian history, as a description of Indian condition, and as a picture of Indian society and manners, it is little better than a work of the imagination. Let its general views be contrasted with a *summary* of Indian character lately published in a contemporary Journal;* and it will be obvious, that its author wrote under the influence of warm attachments and strong prejudices. To the fidelity of this general summary, it affords us pleasure to bear witness. It describes the Indians, as we have found them, with some virtues and many vices; prone to action more than reflection; yielding to the fiercest passions; with few efforts to acquire knowledge, and still fewer to improve the heart; and fading, wasting, disappearing before our vices and their own.

By examining Mr Heckewelder's 'History of the Moravian Missions,' his memoir, submitted, with other documents, to the Senate of the United States in 1823, and his history of the Indians; the nature of his intercourse with the various tribes, and his opportunities of surveying and describing them may easily be ascertained. It will be found, and such we know to have been the fact, that he had no general acquaintance with the Western Indians. His intercourse was confined to a small band of the Delaware tribe, who during many years received the humane attentions of the Moravians, and who had lost many of their own distinctive traits without acquiring ours. This band, after various migrations, settled upon the Muskingum river, about seventy miles west of Pittsburgh, and here Mr Heckewelder's knowledge of the Indian character was principally acquired. His band was removed from this place by the British authorities during the revolution-

* The Western Museum.

ary war, to the river Huron of Lake St Clair, and Mr Heckewelder accompanied and remained with them a short time. One journey to Vincennes, and two or three shorter excursions upon the business of the mission, and we have the whole history of his intercourse with the Indians. Of the Wyandots, the Ottawas, the Chippewas, the Potawatamies, the Miamies, the Shawnese, the Kickapoos, all tribes of that region, he knew nothing. And if a comparison be instituted between his 'Narrative' and 'Memoir' and his 'History,' it will be obvious that the latter has passed through other hands, and has assumed an appearance its author could never have given it. These three works, as they appear before the public, were never written by the same person.

If it be now asked, What peculiar claims had Mr Heckewelder to our confidence, and upon what is founded his right to unsettle our knowledge of these subjects, and to introduce 'new views of the Indian character?' the answer must be, Neither the powers of research or observation he has displayed, nor the advantages of situation and intercourse enjoyed by him; neither the constitution of his own mind, nor the circumstances in which he was placed. At the extremity of a long life, and after his attention had been many years withdrawn from kindred topics, he was called upon for his collections and recollections, for a minute account of all he had seen, and heard, and done during half a century. With enfeebled faculties (and we trust we may say this with reference to human nature generally, and not subject ourselves to any charge of unkindness towards this venerable man), he undertook his task, and it should excite no surprise, that his work is almost a collection of anecdotes, to which he had listened in his earlier life with the faith and fondness of a Delaware.

We have said that the effect of this work is visible upon the literature of the day; and a stronger illustration of this fact cannot be found, than in the various sketches of Indian condition and character interspersed through the novels of Cooper. With the powers of invention and description displayed by this writer, it is a source of regret that he did not cross the Alleghany, instead of the Atlantic, and survey the red man in the forests and prairies, which yet remain to him. If he would collect his materials from nature, instead of the shadowy representations he has studied, he might give to the world a series of works, as popular and interesting as any that adorn

the literature of the day. Nor is there in the whole range of literature, a subject more happily adapted to that union of powerful invention and faithful delineation, which forms the charm of modern novels. Should our popular novelist adopt this course, he would discover how far he has wandered from nature in following the path marked out by Mr Heckewelder. He would find that an Indian does not always speak in figures and parables. In the 'Last of the Mohicans,' and in the 'Prairie,' scarcely a conversation can be found, in which questions are directly asked and directly answered. We quote a few specimens of this manner.

'A gull fans a thousand miles of air to find the sea; the women and children of a pale face cannot live without the meat of a bison; a head is white, but there is a forked tongue; the leaves cover the trees in the season of fruits; a tongue with two ends, like a serpent; they listen like deer to the step of a cougar; no one can tell the number of the stars. Is the Tetou a fish, that he can see it in the river? The eagle at the falls of the endless river was in its egg, many snows after my hand had struck a Pawnee. If any of his words fall to the ground, they will pick them up and hold them to their ears. He gave them tongues, like the false call of the wild cat-bird; hearts like rabbits; the cunning of the hog (but none of the fox), and arms longer than the legs of the moose. Let the eyes of a dying eagle gaze on the rising sun. He has only manifested, that he is a singing bird. Look at the sun; he is now in the upper branch of the hemlock. Before the sun could go his length, the little water would be in the big.'

This is not the manner in which Indians talk, nor is it the manner in which any people talk. When strongly excited and in their public councils, they express themselves figuratively, but even then, not so generally as has been often represented.

There seem to be set phrases, applicable to solemn occasions, which are introduced into their public addresses. In ordinary conversation, their language is plain and unornamented, and as free from the labored conceits, we have quoted, as they themselves are from affectation. They are not of the Hudibrastic school;

' he could not ope
His mouth, but out there flew a trope.'

'They number,' says one of the speakers in the Prairie, 'as many as the fingers of my hand.' No Indian from Patagonia to Hudson's Bay ever used this periphrastic expression for the

simple word *ten*. It is rather difficult to believe the author can be serious. An Indian will hold up his fingers if apprehensive he cannot be understood, and appeal by significant gestures to the eye ; but to those who understand him he will use the proper numeral.

The most extravagant conceit, however, is, that ‘ to an Indian eye a humming-bird leaves his track in the air.’ It was doubtless such an eye, that enabled the party in pursuit of the lost daughters of *Monro* to distinguish the moccasin tracks of *Le Renard Subtil* and *Magua*, and actually to turn a rivulet from its course, and discover in its bed, the traces of their enemies.

The author has been led into these extravagances by the authority of *Mr Heckewelder*. It is visible in the whole narrative of this flight and pursuit. With sagacity and perceptions beyond the lot of man, the slightest impressions disclose to them the path of their enemies, and the incidents of their journey are developed with unrivalled acuteness. But in real life, such a result would be impossible. The objects interesting to an Indian are almost confined within the circle of his animal wants and desires. They are comparatively few, and his attention is therefore directed to them with undivided force. His powers of observation are invigorated by daily habit ; as the sight of the sailor, and the hearing of the blind man, are sharpened by the exercise of these faculties. But an Indian can be lost in the woods, as we know from our own observation, and whole families too often perish from hunger.

Mr Heckewelder’s account of the costume of the Indian jugglers is also transferred to the ‘ *Last of the Mohicans*,’ and a man actually walks and growls through an Indian camp in a bear-skin, and is mistaken by the Indians for a bear. We have seen these dresses, and can assure our readers, that a man thus encased looks like anything rather than a living quadruped ; and it is a poor compliment to an Indian’s sagacity, to suppose he would be thus deceived.

But it is not alone in the objects and incidents of external life, that the author of these novels has consulted the book of *Mr Heckewelder*, instead of the book of nature. He describes beings, with feelings and opinions, such as never existed in our forests. They possess elevated sentiments, pure morality, delicacy of feeling, and disinterested attachments ; such as are oftener found in the pages of romance, than even in the highest

walks of civilized life. And they equally excel in the minor virtues. 'The Pawnee,' so we are told in 'the Prairie,' 'gracefully threw his shield over one shoulder, and placing a hand on his chest, he bent his head in deference to the grey locks,' &c. An Indian bowing to old age with his hand on his breast! Such a scene would indeed be new. In the thousands we have seen, a spectacle like this never met our eyes.

We have no disposition to pursue this subject. We have derived too much pleasure from these works, and feel too deep an interest in the reputation of the author, to find the task of pointing out his errors an agreeable one. Where he has drawn from his own abundant resources, he has been eminently successful, but in his delineations of character, and in those touches of nature which form the distinctive traits of different people, he has failed. His Uncas, and his Pawnee Hardheart, for they are both of the same family, have no living prototype in our forests. They may wear leggins and moccasins, and be wrapped in a blanket or a buffalo skin, but they are civilized men, and not Indians. They have the never failing impress of civilization in the dignity of their sentiments, and in the whole spirit of their conduct and conversation. They are the Indians of Mr Heckewelder, and not the fierce and crafty warriors and hunters, that roam through our forests.

On a former occasion, we expressed our doubts of the accuracy of Mr Heckewelder's philological investigations, and of his knowledge of the Delaware language. Our opinions have been called in question; and as the school he has formed has able and zealous disciples, it is important, in the future progress of similar inquiries, that his qualifications should be rigidly examined, and his labors properly appreciated. With these views, we annex a critical examination of a part of the vocabulary appended to his work; and if we are not greatly deceived, it will be manifest, that his acquaintance with the language was superficial, and that little confidence can be placed in the process he adopts, or in the conclusions he attains. In fact, there is a visible confusion in his ideas and a looseness in his translations, utterly incompatible with that severity of research and exactness of knowledge, which give to investigations into the philosophy of language, their principal value.

That we are warranted in these remarks, will, we think, appear from the following examination of some of the words and phrases appended to Mr Heckewelder's observations on the Delaware language.

N'gauwi, 'I drink.' This should be *n'gówe*, and means, 'I sleep.'

N'wachpácheli, 'I awake.' This is a Munsee word. In Delaware it is *n'doghchéla*, 'I awake.'

N'papommissi, 'I walk.' This is a Munsee word, and means 'I am walking about.' The Delaware word for 'I walk,' is *n'baupomúskaw*.

N'mamentschi, 'I rejoice.' This is Munsee. In Delaware it is *n'oldun'doom*.

N'dachwil, 'I swim.' This should be spelt *n'das'chewil*.

N'nanepauwi, 'I stand.' This is Munsee, and means 'I stand in different places.' In Delaware, *n'epi* means 'I stand.'

N'schiweléndam, 'I am sorry.' This word is Munsee, and is pronounced *n'gewalun'dum*. In Delaware it is *n'jealun'dum*.

N'nipitine, 'I have the tooth-ache.' This should be *n'wepeteéne*.

N'schawússi, 'I am weak.' This should be *n'jow'see*.

N'túppocu, 'I am wise.' There is no such word in the Delaware. It should be *n'lup'po*.

N'nanólhand, 'I am lazy.' This word means, 'I am always lazy.' *N'ólehund*, is 'I am lazy.'

Gótschemunk, 'Go out of the house.' The word is *gotsché-mink*, and means 'out' only. To express 'go out,' they must say *gotsh'emink awl*, 'out go' or rather 'move.'

Ickalli aal, 'Away with you.' *Aal* or *awl* signifies 'to move,' whether going or coming and *ickalli* is 'there.'

N'nipauwi, 'Stop there.' This is Munsee, and means 'stand there.' In Delaware it is *nenepaúe*, 'there stand.'

Undacháal, 'Come here.' This should be *won'dach awl*, 'this way' or 'that way' (indicated by pointing) 'move.'

Tauwúnni, 'Open the door, lid,' &c. This is Munsee, and means 'open it.' In Delaware, *tunkshánee k'paúhoon*, signifies 'open the door.'

Pisellissu, 'Soft.' This means 'shrivelled.' *Tóka* is 'soft.'

Kulupatschi, 'Otherwise, on the other hand, else, however.'

K'quilap'djee, is the word intended, and it is used when anything happens contrary to expectation, as if a man arrives by one road, when he is expected by another.

Nahaliwi, } 'Both,' (of them.) { The first word is intended
Eiyeliwi, } { for a Delaware word,

but it should be written *nauhalé*, and means 'notwithstanding'; as, 'I will do it notwithstanding it is wrong.' There is no such word in Delaware or Munsee as *eyeliwi*; the word meant is *aléwe*, 'both.' *A'lee* is the Delaware word for 'both.'

Attáne léwi, 'It is not true.' This is Munsee. It should be *mut'ta ne láee*.

Alla gaski lewi, 'It cannot be true.' This is neither Munsee nor Delaware. It should be *mut'ta gus'ki láee*, 'Not can be true.'

Bischi, 'It is so.' *Pish'e* is the proper orthography.

N'wingallauwi, 'I like to hunt.' This is Munsee. It is in Delaware *n'wingaulaúe*.

N'sching'i mikemósi, 'I don't like to work.' It means, 'I hate to work.'

N'winginammen, 'I like it.' This means, 'It is pleasing to the sight.' From *n'win'ge*, 'I like,' and *n'áman*, 'I see.'

N'mechquihn, 'I have a cold, cough.' This is Munsee. It is in Delaware *n'oquéena*, 'I have a cough.'

Undach lennemáuwil, 'Reach it to me.' This is Munsee.

N'schauwihilla, 'I am weak, faint.' This is Munsee. It should be *n'jáuéhela*, which means, 'I am wearied with exertion.' 'I am weak' is *n'jow'see*.

N'daptessi, 'I sweat.' This is Munsee. It is in Delaware *n'daupteck'see*.

N'dágotschi, 'I am cold, freezing,' &c. It is 'I am cold.'

N'dellennówi, 'I am a man.' This should be *n'dunnow'e*.

N'dochquéwi, 'I am a woman.' *N'dochquáe*.

N'dam'andommen, 'I feel.' This means, 'I feel it.'

Lécheen, 'To exist, breathe,' &c. This word is never used by itself.

Ili kleheléche? 'Do you draw breath yet?' A Delaware would not thus express himself. He would say, *Quiaúque hutch'k'lehelléha?* 'Yet you live?'

Leheléche ili nitis N. N.? 'Does my favorite friend N. N. yet draw breath?' This expression would not be used by a Delaware.

Gooch ili lehelécheu? 'Does your father yet draw breath?' A Delaware would say, *Kooh'hutch quiaúque lehellaháo?* 'Your father yet live?'

Gáhaweas ili lehelecheu? 'Does your mother draw breath yet?' *Gáhaweas* is neither Delaware nor Munsee. *Káu-haas* is 'your mother.'

Wáchelemi, 'Afar off.' Munsee. It should be *o'helemé*.

Péchuat, 'Near, nigh.'

Pechuwiwi, 'Near (not far off).' } *Péchuat*, in English ortho-

Pechútschi, 'Near.' } graphy, *páhowut*, is 'near.'

Pahóótshe is 'nearer,' and

pahotit'e is 'very near.' *Pechuwiwi* is Munsee.

Alíge, 'if so, nevertheless.' The word meant is *oléka*.

Yu undachqui! 'This way,' &c. *Yu* is 'well,' or an affirmative. *Undáchqui*, properly *wondoc'que*, is 'this way,' or 'that way.' A Delaware would use it, when he said, 'You go this way,' 'you go that way,' and would indicate which by his gestures.

Ickalli undachqui! 'Still further on that way.' *Ickálle* has already been stated to be 'there,' and *wondoc'que* to be 'this way,' or 'that way.' It is used when a person is seeking anything, and another wishes to tell him he is wrong, and must look elsewhere. If he were required to look farther, in the same direction, he would be told, *Ickawléétshe*.' If to one side or the other, *Wondaquétshe*, the speaker pointing in the proper direction.

Wullih, 'Yonder!' The proper word is *wollé*, 'yonder.'

Wullih teh! 'Beyond that.' *Wollé tá*, 'yonder there.'

Tauwihilla, 'Sunk, it has sunk.' Incorrect. *Qu'táihila* is 'sunk.'

Gachpallátam, 'Let us go out and go on shore.' *Gaupáutam* is 'Let us go ashore.' *Gaupallaútam*, 'Let us take him out.' *Gaupautoótum*, 'Let us take it out.'

Pusik! 'Embark (ye).' *Póóseckw'* is the word.

N'petalogálgun! 'I am sent as a messenger.' This is not Delaware. It should be *n'betaloogaúlook*, 'I am sent,' from *n'baat'*, 'I come,' and *aloogaúkuna*, 'a hireling.'

N'sagimaum petalogálgun yu petschi, 'My chief has sent me as a messenger to you.' *Yu* is 'well,' and *pet'schi* is an affirmative merely. The translation, after correcting it as above, is 'My chief has sent me, well, yes.' No Delaware would use the expression.

Sedpook! 'At day-break.' The word is *set'pook*, and means, 'early in the morning.' *Petaúpun*, is 'day-break,' from *paó*, 'come,' and *opun'*, 'day.'

N'dellgun lachpi gatta páame, 'I was told to hasten, and return quickly.' Munsee. Literally, 'He told me quick, try, return.'

N'mauwi pihm, 'I am going to take a sweat.' Munsee. The expression in Delaware is *n'maúee peemoóá*, 'I go to sweat.'

N'dapi pihm. The same.

N'dapellauwi, 'I am come from hunting.' In Delaware this is *n'dapallaúe*.

Notameschican, 'A fishing spear, gig,' &c. This is not so. It should be *notamenzeékun*.

Achquaneman, 'A bush net.' This is incorrect. It is a Munsee word, and is applied to any kind of net. *Okoneékun* is the Delaware word for 'net.'

Gophammen, } 'To shut up anything close, a door,' &c.
K'páhammen, } Neither of these words is ever used by a Delaware in this form. When connected with a proper person or object, they are both used in a different form.

K'pahi, 'Shut the door.' This is wrong. The proper translation is, 'shut it.' It may be applied to a door, trunk, or to anything, to which 'shut' may be applied. *K'pah'i k'paúhoon* means 'shut the door.'

K'paskhamen, 'To plug up tight.' This word is never used by itself, as observed of *gopham'men*. The proper meaning of the word, intended to be used here, is to 'shut with something soft.' From *k'pah'i*, 'I shut it,' and *sees'ko*, 'mud.' *N'grpskom'men*, 'I shut it,' (with something soft, as mud, moss, &c.)

Tauwun, 'Open the door.' } There is no such word
Tauwunni, 'Open the door for me.' } as *tauwun*. *Tauwun'nee*, is 'open,' and is applied whenever our word 'open' is applied. It is Munsee. *Tunkshaáne* is the Delaware word for 'open.' *Tunkshaáne k'paúhoon*, 'Open the door.' *Tunkshaánnemoui k'paúhoon*, 'Open the door for me.'

N'tschu! 'My friend.' } *Netshoó* is a 'female
N'tschútti, 'Dear, beloved friend.' } friend,' and is applied
Nítis, 'Confidential friend.' } by one female to another, when speaking to her friend. When speaking of her female friend to a third person, she says, *netshoos*. A man, when speaking of his male friend, says *nétees*, 'my friend.' When speaking to his male friend, he says, *n'jeú*. *N'jeute áte*, spelt by Mr Heckewelder *n'tschutti*, is used by a man, when speaking to his male friend, and means, 'my dear friend.'

Pélelaan, 'It begins to rain.' The word is *pátelaen*.

Achwi sokelaan, 'It rains very hard.' *Achwi* is Munsee, and means 'much' or 'very.'

Peelhácquon, 'It thunders.' This is incorrect. The word is *Paathoc'quon*, 'It begins to thunder,' from *Paö*, 'to come,' and *hoc'quon*, 'thunder.'

M'chaquíéchen, 'The streams are up.' This is not Delaware. An Indian would say, *M'hauque'hun*. This is understood by them to mean, 'The river is high,' although river, which is *sépoo*, is not expressed. But when used in the plural, this omission is always supplied, and they say, *M'hauqué-hunno sépooa*, 'The rivers are high.'

Choppécát, 'The water is deep.' This is Munsee. In Delaware *heet'que* means 'deep,' but is used only with reference to water, and is thus understood, without adding *sépoo*, 'river,' or *nébé*, 'water.'

Meetschi hígihelleu, 'The waters are falling.' 'Already falling.' Applied only to a stream.

Sichelleu méetschi. 'The waters have run off.' Not so.

Jatehúppecat, 'Shallow water.' This is Munsee. In Delaware *ga'hun* is 'shallow water.' Mr Heckewelder makes two words, and calls the former shallow, and the latter very low water.

Bulpécát, 'Deep dead water,' &c. There is no such word in the language. 'Dead water' is *K'lumpáhun*, and this is probably meant by the next word,

Clampéching, which Mr Heckewelder calls 'a dead running stream,' &c.

Kscháchan, 'The wind.' *Kaash'hiuk* is 'wind,' and *k'shaúhun* means, 'It blows hard.' Which of these two words was intended to be written, does not appear.

Ta úndchen? 'From whence blows the wind?' This is Munsee, and literally means, 'Where wind?' In Delaware it would be *Ta hutshwon'hun*, 'Where wind?' from *ta*, 'where,' *hutsh*, a word used in all interrogations, *won'gee*, 'from,' *k'shaúhun*, 'wind,' the first and last syllables of which words are joined, and from *won'hun*, which implies the course of the wind.

Kschiechpécát, 'Clear water,' &c. This is Munsee, and means 'water that has been muddy or dirty and becomes clear.'

Never applied to a stream. *Wootup'pocut* is 'clear water.'

Achgumhocquat, 'Cloudy.' Munsee. *Kumhoc'quot*, is 'cloudy.'

Packenum, 'Dark.' It should be, *pees'ka*.

Pekenink, 'In the dark.' This is not correct. It should be *en'daupeeskâke*.

Pisgeu, 'It is dark.' Properly *Peeskâo*.

Pisg'eke, 'When it becomes dark.' This should be *Peeskaka*, and means, 'at dark.'

Nanni, nan, 'That.' There are two words for 'that.' One, *nanné*, applied to animate, and another, *nenné*, applied to inanimate objects. *Nan* is Munsee.

M'biak, 'A whale.' We know of no such word. *M'hing'wa-maak* is 'a large fish.'

Yuh'allauwitan, 'Come, let us go a hunting.' The proper word is *Alleneétum*, and it means, 'Well, let us hunt.'

Nelema n'metenaxiwi, 'I am not yet ready.' This word should be written *n'matenaxé*.

K'metenaxi yucki? 'Are you now ready?' The word *yucki* should be written *yook'we*, and the expression is affirmative, and not interrogative, 'You are now ready.'

Nelema n'gischambelaniwash, 'I have not yet done tying up my pack.' *Neléma*, is, 'not yet,' *n'gisch'ambila*, is, 'I have tied him,' and is applicable to animate objects only. It cannot be applied to a pack. *Niwash*, is a Munsee word, signifying 'my load.' In Delaware, *N'weeshóne*, is 'my load.' The literal translation of this compound of Munsee and Delaware is, 'Not yet I have tied him my load.'

Shuck soketaaw gachtauwi, 'But it will rain.' *Shuck* is 'but,' and *sókelaun* is 'to rain,' and a Delaware, after adding a proper termination to the verb, would say no more. *Gachtauwe* signifies 'a desire to do anything.' *N'gachtaumeétsee*, 'I desire to eat.' If a Delaware wished to say, 'But it will rain,' he would thus express himself, *Shook' sókelauntsh*.

To hatsch gemawikeneen? 'At what place shall we encamp?' This should be, *Tatsh'hutsh kemaieekáneen*, 'Where shall we encamp?'

W'diungoakhannink, 'At the white-oak run.' This is not Delaware.

Meechek achsinink, 'At the big rock.' *Maátshé* is 'already,' *aughsun* is a 'stone,' and *ink* the mark of locality. The literal translation of this phrase, after correcting the orthography, is 'already at the stone.'

Gauwahlenink, 'At the place of the fallen timbers.' *Kauogh-húnink* is the word intended to be written. It is formed from *taúhun*, 'wood,' and *kaueéheela*, 'to fall by wind,' and it here means, 'at the wind fall.'

Yapéwi, 'On the river bank.' There is no such word. *Yau-paáe* means the 'shore' or 'margin of a pond, creek, river,' &c. 'On' is not expressed here.

Gamink, 'On the other side of the river.' The word is *káw-mink*, and means, 'on the other side of any collection of water.'

Eli shingeeek, 'On the flat.' *Elé* is 'along ;' *shin'ga*, means 'level land,' and is principally applied to river bottom ; *k*, or *ik*, is the mark of locality. The words mean, 'along the bottom.'

Fekinink, 'In the woods.' A Delaware would not suffix the *ink* here, because it is not applied so generally. It denotes a particular place.

Pockhapockink, 'At the creek between the two hills.' This is not Delaware. Those ideas could not be expressed by one word, in that language.

Menatheink, 'On the island.' This is wrong. *Menawtáyoonk* is 'island,' with the mark of locality.

Sakunk, 'At the outlet of the river.' This should be *endasá-koóweek*, 'at the mouth of a river.'

Atta n'palleho, 'No, I missed him.' We know of no such word as *atta*. *Matta* is a Munsee negative. *N'bal'haú* is 'I missed him.'

Biesch knewa, 'Then you did see one.' This is Munsee. In Delaware it would be *Piohée k'náyau*, 'Then you saw him.'

Nachen n'newa achluch, 'Three times I saw deer.' This should be *Náhun naóne autoókaak*, 'Thrice I saw deer ;' the sentence literally translated, 'Thrice I saw him deer.'

Quonna eet k'pun gummachtíl, 'Perhaps your powder is bad.'

Quonnaeet cannot be separated. As the sentence now stands it is, 'Perhaps your powder bad.' It should be *Quon'neet k'pun'gum machtut'so*.

Na leu, 'That is true.' This is incorrect. It is Munsee, and means, 'Yes true.' A Delaware would say, *Nat'ta n'láho*.

Achtschingi packteu, 'It scarcely took fire.' *Achtsching'e* is 'scarcely,' and *packtáo* means 'sudden noise,' like the discharge of a gun.

Achtchuik wennan, 'Are there plenty of deer, where you were?' This is not Delaware. It should be *Achtookeéka hutsh, way'nun*, 'Are deer plenty, where you came from.'

Atta ta husca, 'Not a great many.' Not Delaware. It should be *takoó*, 'not,' *whooská*, 'many very.'

Naugutti schuck n'peenhalle, 'I saw but few tracks.' This is wrong. *Naungoóte* means, 'sparsely, here and there;' *shook* is 'but;' and *n'peenhaúle* is, 'I tracked him.'

Biesch n'peenhalle mauchau, 'I tracked but one.' This is not Delaware.

Shuck n'dallemons mehane, 'But my dog.' *Mehane* should be *mor'kona*, and the phrase literally translated is, 'But my animal dog' *N'dal'lemons* is generally prefixed to the names of domestic animals.

Palliuchaschiha, 'Drove him off.' This is not Delaware.

N'pachkhameu gachtawi, 'I want to get' bled.' A Delaware would say, *N'gachtáuwee pack hamaúké*.

Woak n'nipitine, 'And have the tooth-ache.' It means, 'And my tooth aches.'

Witschhemil, 'Help me.' This word is confined to assistance rendered to a person's pecuniary concerns, labor, &c. It is never applied to relief from pain, sickness, &c.

Mileen, 'To give, the giving.' This word is not in the language.

N'milgun, 'It was given to me.' This should be translated, 'He gave me.'

Milo, 'Give him.' This should be *Méla*.

Milatamo, 'Let us give him.' This should be *Mélaútum*, 'Let us give him.' *Mélaútum móke*, 'Let us give them.'

Seke, 'Hush.' *Sáh* is the proper word.

Eekhackewitschik mamachtagewak, 'The nations are warring against each other.' This means literally, 'the tribes are fighting.' The word translated 'nation,' is the one applied to the various Indian tribes.

Napenaltowaktsché, 'They will be scalping each other.' This word means, 'They will pursue one another.' There is nothing here which indicates scalping.

Lennape n'hackay, 'I am an Indian.' This means merely 'Delaware, my body.'

Taktani schuck n'tschupinawe, 'I don't know; but I mistrust him.' 'I do not know, but he appears strange to me,' or 'is a stranger.' There is nothing implying mistrust.

Gichgemotket quónna, 'Probably he is a thief.' *Kemookháa* is, 'He steals,' and *Gichemotket*, or properly *Kehkehmooótkaat*, is, 'He is in the habit of stealing.'

N'gemote muke n'dallemons nechnaunges, 'My horse has been stolen from me.' *N'dallemons n'gemootemook'haan negh-enaon'gaas*. This is the Delaware for, 'My horse has been

stolen from me.' After correcting the orthography and the relative position of the words, the sentence given by Mr Heckewelder, would be, 'He stole my horse.'

Wichwinggi gemotgewak Mengwe, 'The Mingoes are very fond of stealing.' After correcting the orthography, the proper translation is, 'They are fond of stealing, the Mingoes.'

Yuh amachgidieu, 'They are vagabonds.' This is Munsee, and means 'Well, he does bad.' If a Delaware wished to say 'They are bad people,' he would thus express himself, *Amut'shee lus'sowuk*.

Schiki a na Lenno, 'That is a fine pretty man.' This is not Delaware, but bad Munsee.

Siquonne lappitsch knewi lehellecheyan! 'In the spring you will see me again, if I am alive.' This should be *sekon'-getsh*, 'next spring,' *lap'pee*, 'again,' *k'naáe*, 'you will see me,' *leh'eleaúne*, 'if I am alive. *Siquonne*, properly *sé-konne* is the 'past spring,' from *sékon*, 'spring,' and *nee*, 'past.' The mark of the future, *tsh*, which should be applied to *sékon*, to indicate the 'next spring,' is erroneously applied to the adverb.

Yuh shuck mámschali! 'Well! but do remember me.' *Mam-schaúle* means 'Think of me now.' It should be *Mam-schaulemee*, 'Think of me hereafter.'

Natsch leu, 'It shall be so.' *Nutsh*, which is the word intended to be given here, is the mark of the future merely, and not a verb.

N'uuntschimke, 'I have been called.' The word is, *N'wen-jeem'ka*, 'I am called.' *N'wenjeemkáhumb*! 'I was called.'

N'dochquéum, 'My wife.' This word means 'my female relation. *Ne hóushum* is 'my wife,' from *nee*, 'mine,' *hauooshésis*, 'an old woman.'

Quanna eet auween gatta napenalgun! 'Perhaps somebody is coming to attack and scalp us.' This should be rendered, after correcting it, 'Perhaps some person wishes to come and attack us.' The idea of scalping is not conveyed here.

Wulli ta pepannik! 'Yonder they are coming.' There is no such word as *papannik*. It should be *Wulli paoótsheek*, 'Yonder they come.'

Papomiscuak? 'Are they on foot?' This word is in the plural number of the imperative mood, and means 'Walk about.' *Pamuskáóke hutsh* is 'Do they walk?'

Gachtonalukguntsh matta uchschimuiénge, 'We shall be at-

tacked if we do not make off with ourselves.' *Gachtonalukguntsh* is a word made without authority, like many others in the collection. The author probably intended to form *Kuttoonalookoónaak*, which, from its elements, would mean, 'They desire to attack us.' The mark of the future should not be added. The residue of the sentence should be *Aléke w'sheemweétum*, 'Well let us run away.'

Mattapewiwak nik schwannakwak, 'The white people are a rascally set of beings.' This is Munsee, and properly translated means *Mattapawéwauk*, 'bad people,' *nik*, 'they,' *schuanaukwak*, 'whites.'

Pennan won, 'Look at that one.' *Pennan* is 'see' or 'look at,' and *won* is any animate being.

Mamanúxu, 'He is angry.' *Manoónxee* is 'He is angry.'

Mamanoónxu means 'He has been angry some time, and is yet angry.'

Pihmtónheu, 'He has a crooked mouth.' This means, 'He makes a wry mouth,' from *pelema*, 'crooked,' *p'tóne*, 'mouth,' and *háó*, 'to do' or 'make a thing.' *Pehm'tonea* means 'He has a crooked mouth.'

Ilau, 'He is a great war captain.' *E'lau* means 'a person who cannot be hit by a bullet.' It is one of the superstitious notions of the Indians, and the exemption is supposed to be derived from dreams. The word is a substantive, and there is no affirmation implied. Nor has it any relation to the qualities of a war chief. A person may be an *e'lau*, who never saw a gun and never went to war. *E'loiyo* means he is an *e'lau*.

Sakimau, 'He is a chief.' The word means 'chief' only.

Kschamehellátan, 'Let us run together.' The word merely implies 'Let us run.'

In the preceding corrections, the duplication of the vowel indicates its long sound, unless marked by a *diæresis*, when each vowel is to be pronounced.

It will be seen by our remarks hereafter, that when the meaning is rendered by *is*, *does*, &c. the auxiliaries are used with much freedom. Our object has been to point out some of the prominent errors of Mr Heckewelder, not to give an exact notion of the idiom of the language. We have attempted this in the concluding part of the present article.

The structure of the Indian languages is a subject of interesting speculation. There is an intimate connexion between

the powers and process of the mind, and the means by which its operations are disclosed. Without adopting, to its full extent, the fanciful theory of the author of 'Hermes,' by which he accounts for those peculiarities, which characterize different languages, we may yet concede, that powerful causes, physical and moral, operating upon the condition and disposition of a people, may give a particular direction to their thoughts, and a particular modification to the vehicle, by which they are conveyed. After all the laudatory remarks, which have been made on the subject of the Indian languages, it will be found, that they partake essentially of the character of the people, who use them. They are generally harsh in the utterance, inartificial in their construction, indeterminate in their application, and incapable of expressing a vast variety of ideas, particularly those which relate to invisible objects. Curious coincidences no doubt exist between these tongues and those of the eastern world, but discrepancies are also found, marking their different origin, and indicative of the circumstances and mental habits of their possessors. We have before observed, that the Indians are more prone to action than reflection, and this trait in their character has produced a corresponding effect upon their modes of speech. They employ few abstract terms, because their attention is directed to the visible objects around them, and to the relations, which these bear to themselves. A similar tendency existed in the Latin language, and led to the complaint of Cicero, that it was unfit for metaphysical investigations.

The conflicting statements of Roger Williams and Dr Edwards respecting the word *father*, in the Mohegan language, may be easily reconciled by adverting to this peculiar feature of the Indian character. The former asserts, that *osh** signifies 'father;' while the latter earnestly maintains, that this word is unknown in the tongue, and that the Mohegans can only say *n'osh*, 'my father,' *k'osh*, 'thy father.'

Now there is no doubt, but this word *n'och* is a compound term formed from the pronominal sign *n'* 'I,' and *och*, 'father,' and that if it became necessary for one of these Indians to express the idea conveyed by our word *father*, he would use the word *Och*. But this would require a process of abstraction,

* This word is thus spelt by Roger Williams. The true pronunciation is the guttural sound, familiar in the Irish, Gaelic, and several of the continental languages, but unknown in the English language.

rarely employed by them. The different degrees of consonguinity are almost always expressed by terms denoting actual subsisting relations.

In Delaware *n'och*, 'my father,' *n'och*, 'thy father,' *ohul*, 'his father,' *n'gahās*, 'my mother,' *n'gwese*, 'my son.' And in the Chippewa *n'osa*, 'my father,' *neengah*, 'my mother.'

That Dr Edwards greatly overrated his own knowledge of the Mohegan is evident, from his strange assertion, that there are 'no adjectives in all their language, unless we reckon numerals, and such words as *all*, *many*, &c. adjectives. Of adjectives, which express the quality of substances, I do not find, that they have any.' And Horne Tooke has appealed to this authority, in support of his speculations concerning the origin and use of this part of speech. But in this instance, as in some others, this acute philologist seems not to be aware, that we may trace etymologies so far, as to lose sight of the existing principles, which regulate the form and application of languages.

The Mohegan is a dialect, closely allied to the Delaware, and they are both branches of the great Algonquin stock, and cognate with the Chippewa, Ottawa, Shawnese, Potawatamie, Miami, Kickapoo, Menomonie, &c. The general structure of these various dialects is the same, and there is no important syntactical formation in one, which is not found in all. It is well known, that adjectives abound in all these languages, which have been investigated, and it would be strange indeed, if they were wanting in this affiliated dialect alone. But it is not difficult to discover the source of Dr Edwards's error, and it may be referred to a principle pervading these languages, of the extent of which he was apparently ignorant. The power of coalescence, if it may be so termed, possessed by the Indian languages is one of their most extraordinary features. Words, and parts of words, are detached and attached, so as to form others, conveying simple or complex ideas, and sometimes without any apparent connexion between the new word and its roots. Attributives, denoting qualities only, without reference to time or affirmation, are as abundant in these as in other languages. But they are not as often used; because their application is more abstract than comports with the mental habits of the Indians. It is seldom necessary for them to talk about a good horse, or a fat buck, or a brave warrior. But when these or similar topics are discussed, the good

horse, and the fat buck, and the brave warrior are identified, and assertions are made concerning them, which are understood, rather from the idiom of the language, than from the expressions employed. The auxiliary verbs are not used, and simple affirmation must be frequently deduced from the collocation of the words, the manner of the speaker, the context, or some other circumstance. An Indian cannot say, *he is strong, he is tall, &c.* but he says, *he strong, he tall, &c.* and the power of coalescence enables him to attach the mark of the past and future time to the adjective; as if we were to say in English, *he tall heretofore, he tall hereafter.*

These particles are,

	Past time.	Future time.
In Delaware,	<i>p</i>	<i>tsh.</i>
In Chippewa,	<i>bun</i>	<i>gah.</i>

And they may also be applied to substantives, pronouns, and we believe to every other part of speech.

In the Delaware, the duplication of the pronoun is said to be equivalent to the verbal assertion, as

N'DOLEMOUS, *my horse.*

Nee n'DOLEMOUS, literally, *my my horse*, and understood to mean, *it is my horse.*

Nee n'DOLEMOUSENAP, literally, *my my horse heretofore*, but understood to mean, *it was my horse.*

Nee n'DOLEMOUSEENTSH, { literally, *my my horse hereafter*, but
Neetsh n'DOLEMOUS, { understood to mean, *it will be my horse.*

We incline to think, however, that this repetition of the pronoun is only to render the declaration more emphatic, as when the right of the party is doubted or denied, and we say in English *it is my horse*, with a particular stress upon the affirmation; but that this does not affect the syntax of the language. We have yet to learn therefore from what peculiar circumstances an assertion is inferred, when it becomes necessary to describe a substance or its quality, and there is no verb to denote the idea. Further inquiries may develop this process, by which an Indian distinguishes between 'a strong man' and 'a man strong,' when the latter expression is intended to include an affirmation. We at first supposed, that it depended upon the relative situation of the two words, but this opinion has been shaken, rather than fortified, by further investigations. In English the conversion of one part of speech into another, is a familiar operation; but the composition of the

sentence, and sometimes the accent, prevent any confusion of ideas. Our invariable arrangement and our auxiliary verbs and prepositions define the meaning to be attached to those words, which may be variously employed; as *like*, which is sometimes a verb, active and neuter, and sometimes a substantive, adjective, or adverb. But auxiliary verbs are wholly wanting in the Indian languages, and prepositions are very sparingly used.

We shall insert two other examples, both in the Delaware, of the use of these verbal adjectives and verbal substantives.

	Literal Meaning.	Meaning, as probably understood.
Sookelaun,	<i>rain,</i>	<i>it rains,</i>
Sookelaun oop,	<i>rain heretofore,</i>	<i>it rained,</i>
Sookelaun tsh,	<i>rain hereafter,</i>	<i>it will rain,</i>
Sookelaun au,	<i>rain perhaps,</i>	<i>it may rain,</i>
Sookelaun oop ΔΥ,	<i>rain heretofore perhaps,</i>	<i>it may have rained,</i>
Sookelaun gad,	<i>if rain,</i>	<i>if it should rain,</i>
Opa,	<i>white,</i>	<i>it is white,</i>
Opa p,	<i>white heretofore,</i>	<i>it was white.</i>
Opa tsh,	<i>white hereafter,</i>	<i>it will be white.</i>
Opa u,	<i>white perhaps,</i>	<i>it may be white.</i>
Opa p ΔΥ,	<i>perhaps white heretofore,</i>	<i>it may have been white.</i>
Opa ka,	<i>if white,</i>	<i>if it be white.</i>
Opa κε pona,	<i>if white heretofore,</i>	<i>if it have been white.</i>
Opa κ atsh,	<i>if white hereafter,</i>	<i>if it shall be white.</i>

K is sometimes a definitive, and, suffixed to an adjective, restricts its application.

Opak,	<i>the white,</i>	<i>that which is white.</i>
Opa kUP,	<i>the white heretofore,</i>	<i>that which was white.</i>

Hutsh always denotes interrogation.

Opa hutsh? *Is it white?*

Wug, the animate, and *wun*, the inanimate mark of plurality may be suffixed to adjectives.

Miskwizzo, red.	Animate. Miskwizzewug, they red.
Miskwau, red.	Inanimate. Miskwauwun, they red.

The principles, which regulate this use and conversion of the adjective, undoubtedly led to the erroneous opinion advanced by Dr Edwards, that this part of speech was wanting in the Mohegan. We have made some inquiry into this matter, and have the authority of three educated men of the tribe for saying, that adjectives exist in that dialect; and we have been furnished with the following among other specimens.

	Animate.	Inanimate.
<i>Good,</i>	wuwehi,	woonut.
<i>Bad,</i>	m'tuthow,	m'tut.
<i>White,</i>	waupauyook,	waupauyuk.
<i>Black,</i>	sakkauyook,	nauthkauyuk.
<i>Red,</i>	mukwayook,	mukwayuk.
<i>Green,</i>	shuskwayook,	uskuthtwayuk.

The opinion, which has been so generally prevalent, that the substantive verb is not found in the Indian languages rests in some measure upon the authority of Dr Edwards, but has been adopted by succeeding writers. We took occasion in a former number to controvert this opinion, but as our conclusions have been called in question, we shall briefly review the subject.

We have shown the manner in which assertions are made in the Indian languages; and such expressions as *horse mine, rifle good, I hungry*, are continually recurring. This anomaly could not but excite the attention of those, who were investigating these modes of speech, and no doubt led to the conclusion, too hastily adopted, that the substantive verb was unknown in them. So far as this verb may be employed to denote simple existence, we believe it is found in all the aboriginal dialects. And it would be as just to deny, that they have any verbs indicating action and possession, because the words *do* and *have* are not used as auxiliaries to other verbs, as it is to deny the existence of the substantive verb, so far as being is implied by it, because it does not perform in combination the office of asserting or affirming.

By the ladies of the family of Mr Johnston, of the Sault Ste Marie, we have been furnished with the conjugation of this verb in the Chippewa, and we shall submit it to our readers, merely observing, that to the accomplishments of civilized life, they add a perfect knowledge of this, their maternal dialect.

IAU, verb animate, To Be.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

1. Present Tense.

Singular.

1. Neen diau,	<i>I am.</i>
2. Kee diau,	<i>Thou art.</i>
3. iau,	<i>He or she is.</i>

Plural.

1. { Kee diau min,	<i>We are (inclu.)</i>
2. { Nin diau min,	<i>We are (exclu.)</i>
2. Kee diau-m,	<i>Ye are.</i>
3. iau wug,	<i>They are.</i>

2. *Imperfect Tense.*

Singular.

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Nin | gee | IAU, | <i>I was.</i> |
| 2. | Kee | gee | IAU, | <i>Thou wast.</i> |
| 3.* | | | | <i>He or she was.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|------|--------|------|-------------------------|
| 1. | { | Kee | gee | IAU | min, | <i>We were (inclu.)</i> |
| | | Nin | gee | IAU | min, | <i>We were (exclu.)</i> |
| 2. | | Kee | gee | IAU-m, | | <i>Ye were.</i> |
| 3. | | IAU | wug, | | | <i>They were.</i> |

3. *Perfect and Pluperfect Tense.*

Singular.

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|---------|----------------------------|
| 1. | Nin | gee | IAU | naubun, | <i>I have been.</i> |
| 2. | Kee | gee | IAU | naubun, | <i>Thou hast been.</i> |
| 3. | | IAU | | bun, | <i>He or she has been.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------------------------|
| 1. | { | Kee | gee | IAU | minaubun, | <i>We have been (in.)</i> |
| | | Nin | gee | IAU | minaubun, | <i>We have been (ex.)</i> |
| 2. | | Kee | gee | IAU-m | waubun, | <i>Ye have been.</i> |
| 3. | | Kee | IAU | buneeg, | | <i>They have been.</i> |

4. *First Future Tense.*

Singular.

- | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Nin | guh | IAU, | <i>I shall be.</i> |
| 2. | Kee | guh | IAU, | <i>Thou, &c.</i> |
| 3. | Tah | | IAU, | <i>He or she, &c.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|-----|--------|------|--------------------------------|
| 1. | { | Kee | guh | IAU | min, | <i>We shall, &c. (in.)</i> |
| | | Nin | guh | IAU | min, | <i>We shall, &c. (ex.)</i> |
| 2. | | Kee | guh | IAU-m, | | <i>Ye shall, &c.</i> |
| 3. | | Tah | | IAU | wug, | <i>They shall, &c.</i> |

5. *Second Future Tense.*

Singular.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Nin | guh | gee | IAU | naubun, | <i>I shall have been.</i> |
| 2. | Kee | guh | gee | IAU | naubun, | <i>Thou, &c.</i> |
| 3. | Tah | | gee | IAU | bun, | <i>He or she, &c.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| 1. | { | Kee | guh | gee | IAU | minaubun, | <i>We shall, &c. (in.)</i> |
| | | Nee | guh | gee | IAU | minaubun, | <i>We, &c. (ex.)</i> |
| 2. | | Kee | guh | gee | IAU-m | wunbun, | <i>Ye, &c.</i> |
| 3. | | Tah | | gee | IAU | buneeg, | <i>They, &c.</i> |

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Singular.

- | | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|------|--------|---------------------------|
| 1. | Nin | gua | IAU | binuh, | <i>Let me be.</i> |
| 2. | | | IAUN | binuh, | <i>Be thou.</i> |
| 3. | Tah | | IAU | binuh, | <i>Let him or her be.</i> |

* Having some doubts respecting the form of the pronoun here, we have omitted it.

Plural.

- | | | |
|--------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. { | IAU dau binuh, | <i>Let us be (in.)</i> |
| 2. { | Nin guh IAU-min binuh, | <i>Let us be (ex.)</i> |
| 3. { | IAU yuek binuh, | <i>Be ye.</i> |
| 3. Tah | IAU wug binuh, | <i>Let them be.</i> |

POTENTIAL MOOD.

Present Tense.

Singular.

- | | | |
|--------|----------|----------------------|
| 1. Nin | dau IAU, | <i>I may be.</i> |
| 2. Kee | dau IAU, | <i>Thou, &c.</i> |
| 3. Tah | IAU, | <i>He, &c.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | |
|--------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. { | Kee dau IAU min, | <i>We, &c. (in.)</i> |
| 2. { | Nin dau IAU min, | <i>We, &c. (ex.)</i> |
| 3. { | Kee dau IAUm, | <i>Ye, &c.</i> |
| 3. Tah | IAU wug, | <i>They, &c.</i> |

Imperfect Tense.

Nin dau IAU koossamau, *I might be.*

Perfect and Pluperfect Tense.

Nin dau gee IAU bun-koossamau, *I may have been.*

SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD.

Present Tense.

Singular.

- | | | |
|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1. Kishpin | IAU yaun, | <i>If I be.</i> |
| 2. Kishpin | IAU yun, | <i>If thou be.</i> |
| 3. Kishpin | IAUd, | <i>If he be.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | |
|------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. { | Kishpin IAU yung, | <i>If we be (in.)</i> |
| 2. { | Kishpin IAU yong, | <i>If we be (ex.)</i> |
| 3. { | Kishpin IAU yag, | <i>If ye be.</i> |
| 3. Kishpin | IAU waud, | <i>If they be.</i> |

The imperfect tense of this mood is the same as the preceding, except that the particle *we* is interposed between the conjunction and verb.

Perfect and Pluperfect Tense.

Singular.

- | | | |
|------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Kishpin | IAU yaumbaun, | <i>If I have been.</i> |
| 2. Kishpin | IAU yumbun, | <i>If thou, &c.</i> |
| 3. Kishpin | IAU pun, | <i>If he, &c.</i> |

Plural.

- | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. { | Kishpin IAU yun ge bun, | <i>If we, &c. (in.)</i> |
| 2. { | Kishpin IAU yaun ge bun, | <i>If we, &c. (ex.)</i> |
| 3. { | Kishpin IAU ya ge bun, | <i>If ye, &c.</i> |
| 3. Kishpin | IAU wau pun, | <i>If they, &c.</i> |

The first future coincides with the preceding, except the introduction of the particle *we* between the conjunction and verb. The second future also coincides with the preceding, save the insertion of the particle *kee* between the conjunction and verb.

INFINITIVE MOOD.

<i>Present Tense,</i>	IAU,	<i>To be.</i>
<i>Perfect Tense,</i>	IAU-bun,	<i>To have been.</i>

PARTICIPLES.

<i>Present,</i>	IAUNG,	<i>Being.</i>
<i>Perfect,</i>	IAUN ge bun,	<i>Having been.*</i>

We are satisfied, that this verb is the root of the Delaware word *iasis*, animal, and that it is its derivative *au*, which added to the names of persons, and to words denoting consanguinity, indicates in that language past existence or death. In the translation of the Lord's Prayer into Mohegan, the first sentence has been rendered,

<i>Father our</i>	<i>above</i>	<i>thou art.</i>
Naghnuh	ne spummuck	oieon.

A friend, in whose judgment and knowledge of this subject we have full confidence, has observed to us, that 'the whole tendency of the Chippewa, and in fact of the Indian languages generally, is to a system of negation. And it is only when compelled by circumstances, that the speaker is driven to the use of this verb, and when so used, full enumeration and strong emphasis are employed.'

Mr Du Ponceau has proposed as the shibboleth of this word the translation of the phrase, *I am that I am*. The selection is not a fortunate one, for the meaning of this expression is not very obvious to the mere English scholar, and there are not wanting respectable authorities, who condemn it as unmeaning. As an assertion however of independent existence, the substantive verb is here employed to convey very different ideas. It is a mere affirmative at the commencement of the sentence, while at its termination it becomes in fact a substantive. A

* We have inserted the above conjugation, as we received it, satisfied of the general form and use of the verb, but not altogether convinced, that the various modifications here given are familiar to the Indians. They are probably approximations toward the English translations, and not parallels to them; and like many similar attempts, are founded upon the artificial arrangement of other languages differing essentially in their principles and construction.

literal translation of such phrases is frequently a difficult task ; but we have been assured, that an exact version of this sentence may be given in the Chippewa. It sometimes occurs in the war and medicine songs, where the most general and often ambiguous terms are employed. On these occasions great mystery is affected, and there is reason to believe, that the initiated endeavor to form their chorusses in such a manner as to be clearly understood by those only, who have been admitted into their medicine and *wabeno* societies.

Among the Miamis it is common for a contentious or quarrelsome person to accost another contemptuously, *Jarnesheshe nakosearn*, 'What are you?' To which the other replies with proper self-respect, *Eshinkosearn*, *eshinkosearn*, literally, 'I am, I am,' but understood to mean, 'I am what I am.'

We have reason to believe, that the distinction between animate and inanimate objects is a pervading principle in all our Indian languages, and it is probably the feature, by which they are most distinctly marked. In the Chippewa its influence is constantly exerted, and we may venture to say, that *no word* is employed without reference to it. The natural distinction of genders is merged in this principle, for there are very few words, and those in almost constant use, in which the gender is indicated by any change or inflection. And it is owing to this peculiar tendency, that there is no word to express *she*, as contradistinguished from *he* ; a fact which has excited much surprise among all who have made these languages their study. The pronoun *ween* in the Chippewa, and its synonyms in the other dialects of the Algonquin stock, signify, *he, she, him, her*. The present state of our information on this point leads us to the conclusion, that *all words*, whether verbs, nouns, pronouns, participles, or particles, must be employed with reference to the existence or non-existence of life in the object. In some dialects, trees and plants are considered as possessing life, while in others it is predicated only of animals. But wherever the line of separation may be drawn, it is visible in all.

The power of coalescence, and this principle of application to animate and inanimate objects, have occasioned the various combinations called personal forms, the conjugations of which are said to occupy *fourteen* folio pages in Zeisberger's Delaware Grammar. The term itself has been derived from the Hebrew, where the objective pronoun may be incorporated with the verb, and thus form a perfect word.

The grammarians who have treated of our Indian languages, have fallen into the error, too common in all philological investigations, of forming their principles upon preëxisting models, and of transferring to these tongues rules of syntax, derived from, and applicable to, different 'plans of ideas.' A rigid analysis, however, will generally show, that, excepting those elements of universal grammar which are common to all tongues, because they are essential either to the objects of speech, or to their due attainment, the Indians are possessed of languages, having no affinity, either in their etymology or construction, to any others which are known to us.

There is no verb applicable to the great departments of animate and inanimate nature, which has not a form or termination indicating its proper class. Whatever may be said respecting the root of these verbs, it is in fact never used by the Indians. *Saug* is doubtless the root of the verbs *saugeau* and *saugetōn*, 'to love,' but it is never heard in this abstract form. *Au* is derived from *iau*, 'to be,' and when added to *saug*, it makes the application of the word to the class of animate objects. *Attōn* is a 'thing,' or inanimate matter, and when suffixed to the above root, the word becomes *suagetōn*, 'to love an inanimate thing.' And here it may be well to remark, that this privilege of coëscence is used with great freedom, and syllables are omitted or inserted, as they affect the euphony of the language. Harmony is thus preserved, and it is a more important consideration than we should be prepared to expect; but changes are introduced, by which the primary words are lost sight of, and these dialects are exposed to perpetual fluctuations.

Nee saugeau, signifies 'I love an animated being,' and *nee saugētōn*, 'I love an inanimate thing,' and whatever other word may be brought to coalesce with these, whether it be an adverb denoting negation or quantity, or a pronoun, or even a substantive, these changes do not constitute distinct forms of the verb, nor are they entitled to the character of separate conjugations. The verb itself is subject to no inflections. Its modal and temporal relations are expressed in these cases, as in all others, and the only change is in the addition or subtraction of an independent word, sometimes in juxtaposition, and sometimes in combination. No grammarian would think of arranging in various conjugations, phrases like these in English, 'I love you,' 'I love him,' 'I love it,' 'you love me,' 'you love us,'

‘you love them,’ ‘I do not love you,’ &c. ‘I love you much, here, there, always,’ &c. And there is no difference between these, and what have been called the personal forms in our Indian languages, except the great facility, already explained, with which the latter accommodate themselves to contractions. We have some formations in strict analogy with these negative conjugations; as, *can’t*, *don’t*, *shan’t*, &c. And if these personal forms, depending upon the change of the actor or patient, and made by the transposition of the pronoun primitive or contracted, are entitled to the consideration given to them, the conjugations of verbs may be indefinitely increased, for this principle of intimate union exerts its influence through the whole language. Such distinctions would be as useless, as they would be endless.

The process, by which the time of action and the modal affections are indicated in the Chippewa is sufficiently uniform and simple. *Neen* signifies the first person, ‘I,’ *keen*, the second person, ‘thou,’ and *ween*, the third person, ‘he’ or ‘she’; *neenowind*, ‘we,’ excluding the person addressed, *keeowind*, ‘we,’ including the person addressed, *keeowau*, ‘ye’ or ‘you,’ *weenowau*, ‘they.’ And it would be perfectly intelligible to use the pronouns thus distinctly, whenever they are placed in concord with a verb. But custom has changed the arrangement and almost the form of some of these pronouns, as it has required in English the substitution of *you* for *thou*. The pronouns of the first and second person singular are invariable in their position, and admit no other change in their form, than the elision of some of their letters. They become *n* or *nee*, *k* or *kee*, as the initial sound of the next word is open or close. The third person singular of the simple affirmative form seems to be the root of the Indian verb, for when thus used, it is understood to assert something respecting a third person. The letter *o* is, however, frequently the sign of this pronoun, but whence its derivation, or what are the rules of its application, we have not yet been able to ascertain. We are inclined to think, that its use indicates the presence, as its omission does the absence, of the person spoken of.

The peculiar idiom of these languages becomes more apparent in the application of these pronouns in the plural number.

Kee <i>saugeau</i> min,	<i>We</i> love (inclusive.)
Nee <i>saugeau</i> min,	<i>We</i> love (exclusive.)
Kee <i>saugeau</i> -m,	<i>Ye</i> love.
<i>saugeau</i> wug,	<i>They</i> love.

Nee and *kee* are respectively 'I' and 'thou,' *min* implies the 'others,' and *wug* is the mark of plurality, and the resolution of the examples will give us 'thou lovest others,' 'I love others,' 'thou lovest others,' 'he loves more than one.' Or in other words 'I and the others love,' 'you and the others love,' 'he and more than one love.' It will be perceived, that the second person plural and the inclusive form of the first person are distinguished from each other by the use of the word *min*, or its initial letter. Sometimes the whole pronoun is employed, and the monosyllable *won* is suffixed to the verb; but as ignorance is preferable to error, and as we do not know the reason or extent of this rule, we content ourselves with stating the fact.

As an example of the various modifications by which the time and accidents connected with affirmation are expressed in the Chippewa, we shall take the verb *saugeau*, 'to love an animate object,' and exhibit the process, by which the combinations of thought and expression are effected. It will be seen, that the verb itself is destitute of all inflection, and although we cannot trace the etymology nor define the meaning of all the auxiliary words, yet there is no reason to doubt, but they are the remains of primitive words originally having some analogous signification, and assuming their present form from that tendency to contraction, common to all languages, and above all to these. This peculiar feature strongly confirms one of the most plausible conjectures of the ingenious Tooke, where he contends, that mood, tense, number, and person are no parts of the verb, and it shows the inutility of multiplying the conjugations, as we have already remarked.

	Ne,	<i>I</i> .	
	saug,	<i>love</i> .	
	e,	a connective.	
	au,	<i>an animated being</i> .	
		First Person.	
Nee,	<i>I</i> ,	<i>saugeau</i> ,	<i>love</i> { <i>animated</i>
Nee,	<i>I</i>		<i>being</i> .
<i>Ningee</i> ,	<i>I have</i>		<i>loved, &c.</i> <i>bun.*</i>
			<i>loved,</i> <i>bun.</i>

* A mark of past time. A derivative of *IAU*, and equivalent to our aorist of the past.

<i>Nin</i> -GAH,	<i>I shall</i>	<i>love,</i>	
<i>Nin</i> GAH GEE,	<i>I shall have</i>	<i>loved,</i>	bun.
<i>Nin</i> GAH,	<i>Let me</i>	<i>love,</i>	beenuh.*
<i>Nin</i> DAU,	<i>I may</i>	<i>love,</i>	
<i>Nin</i> DAU GEE,	<i>I might</i>	<i>love,</i>	
<i>Nin</i> DAU GEE,	<i>I may have</i>	<i>loved,</i>	bun.

Second Person.

Kee,	<i>Thou</i>	<i>lovest,</i>	
<i>Kee</i> GEE,	<i>Thou</i>	<i>lovedst,</i>	
<i>Kee</i> GEE,	<i>Thou hast</i>	<i>loved,</i>	bun.

Third Person.

<i>O,</i>	<i>He, saugeau, or saugeaw,</i>	<i>loves, &c.</i>	
<i>O</i> GEE,			
<i>O</i> GAH, &c.			

The aorist of the past is formed by annexing *bun* to the verb, and that of the future by adding *gah* to the pronoun. The perfect past and the perfect future add *gee* to the pronoun and *bun* to the verb. *Kishpin*, 'if,' is the mark of the conditional affirmation, and *go*, added to the verb, forms the passive voice. By comparing this slight analysis with the conjugation of the verb *iau*, this part of the syntax of the language will be easily understood.

We are not prepared to say, that all the Chippewa verbs can be thus regularly varied, but the exceptions which take place may be considered anomalies, such as are found in all languages, or may be referred to some unknown principle of concord, which future investigation may probably develope.

In the regular formation of these verbs, the pronoun precedes, designating the person, and coalescing with the mark of past or future time; the root of the verb follows, with the sign of the class attached, which is in fact the only inseparable addition made to it. The mark of the aorist or of the definite time, completes the new combination. The inanimate class resembles the other in all respects, except that *toan* is the terminating active mark and *egoan* the passive.

There is a singular coincidence between the formation of the present participle in the Chippewa and in the English, both suffix *ing* to the verb.

	Present.	Past.	Present Participle.
<i>Love,</i>	<i>saugeau,</i>	<i>saugeaubun,</i>	<i>saugeauing.</i>
<i>Walk,</i>	<i>pimmosa,</i>	<i>pimmisabun,</i>	<i>pimmosaing.</i>
<i>Dance,</i>	<i>nemee,</i>	<i>nemeebun,</i>	<i>neming.</i>

Some verbs are converted into substantives by the addition of *win*.

* This word signifies, *let me, permit me.*

Minnequa,	<i>to drink,</i>	minnequawin,	<i>drink.</i>
Aunoke,	<i>to work,</i>	aunokewin,	<i>work.</i>
Odewa,	<i>to traffic,</i>	odewawin,	<i>traffic.</i>

These languages admit no inflections of the substantives, and cases are therefore unknown. The mark of number and of time may be annexed to them, and there are a few compound words, which serve the purpose of prepositions, and which may be combined with nouns. But their meaning is not definite, nor their application extensive; like *ink* in the Delaware, which is a mark of locality, but which has been rendered 'at,' 'in,' 'on,' as the subject seemed to require. The annexation of particular circumstances to general terms, which is necessary from the impossibility of providing a separate term for every complex idea, and which is effected by cases or connectives, is either not done in the Indian languages, or it is done indeterminately. 'I went him town, and saw man head cut off,' is an expression, which marks great want of precision in the speech or thoughts of those who employ it; but it is such an expression as an Indian would use, and in fact from the structure of the language frequently must use. And although from the composition of this sentence, we may collect the meaning of the speaker, yet it is clear, that those words which do not coalesce and are not connected together, must be frequently employed, where their relative operation is indeterminate. And to this cause must be attributed much of the uncertainty attending our Indian translations, too obvious to those, who have heard them, and also the use of gestures in all their conversations, to make up for the poverty of the language.

A few prepositions, indicating local relations are employed, but they are very general in their application. These combine readily with substantives. From the formidable length of most of them, it is evident, that they are compound terms; and perhaps, if we were able to resolve them into their elements, we should find, that they are parts of nouns or verbs, labor-saving machines, expressing by contraction or corruption, in one word, what in the origin of language may have required sentences. But what Tooke has so ably performed for the English particles, we can never expect to see performed for the Indian.

We shall insert a few of these cumbrous appendages.

In the Miami.	
Aupelaukontshee,	<i>behind.</i>
Shaupondee,	<i>through.</i>

In the Chippewa.

Iausewaun,	<i>without.</i>
Nasawûe,	<i>between.</i>
Peenjaie,	<i>within.</i>

The introduction of new animals or instruments among the Indians would naturally lead to the composition of new terms, descriptive of the qualities or appearance of the animals, and of the object or mode of operation of the instrument. And we accordingly find, that the domestic animals, and the productions of civilized life, which the Europeans have introduced among them, have received their appellations by this process.

A horse is called by the Chippewas *pabazhikogauzhee*, from *pabazhik*, 'single,' or undivided, and *ashkunzhee*, 'hoof.'

A plough is called *pegokummebedegun*, from *pegabedoan*, to 'break,' *akkee*, 'earth,' *e*, a connective, and *jegun*, 'instrument.' This word, *jegun*, is the terminating part of the compound words, descriptive of instruments.

Iskodakwajegun, 'tongs,' from *ishkoda*, 'fire,' *takwaudun*, 'bite,' and *jegun*; 'the fire-biter.'

But there are in all these languages many names of animals indigenous to the country, which are compound terms, collecting together some of their most remarkable appearances or qualities. We will not fatigue our readers with the perusal of these long and harsh words, but shall merely exhibit the process, by which these dialects have accommodated themselves to the changes which circumstances have rendered necessary.

A spider is called by the Chippewas a *net-maker*, and a jay, a *bull-frog* bird.

By the Delawares the following appellations have been conferred.

A Panther,	<i>Long tail.</i>
An Otter,	<i>Long dive.</i>
An Opossum,	<i>White face.</i>
A Turkey,	<i>Scratcher.</i>
A Bald Eagle,	<i>White tail.*</i>
Pike,	<i>Long bill.</i>
Catfish,	<i>Fat fish.</i>
Hornet,	<i>White stinger behind.</i>
Yellow Jacket,	<i>Yellow stinger behind.</i>
Honey bee,	<i>Sugar stinger behind.</i>

Very few, perhaps none of the names applied to animals, are arbitrary words, and they presuppose an established nomen-

* There are different words for the tails of quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and insects.

clature of the objects or qualities, associated in combination, before the formation and application of the specific term. The comfort, and in fact the existence, of the Indians depend so essentially upon a few of the fur-bearing and food-supplying animals, that it seems difficult to conceive any period in their history, when they had not some distinguishing appellation for these co-tenants of the forest. They could not look around them, without seeing a buffalo, a deer, a bear, or some other animal, destined for their subsistence by that Providence, which tempers the wind to the shorn lamb. And we believe, that this peculiar trait is a strong proof, that they do not now occupy the country in which their language was formed and matured. In ages long since passed, and probably in other regions, the animals known to them were different from those inhabiting this part of the world. These doubtless received names from them, as well as the other works of creation. But in the erratic migrations to which barbarous tribes are exposed, they perhaps reached a country, whose animal kingdom presented new features, and in applying distinctive appellatives to the objects thus made known to them, they would naturally consult the prominent habits of the animals or revert to their own former associations, and thus compound terms, conveying the new idea.

We shall briefly state a few leading principles, which regulate the construction of our Indian languages, and which give them a primitive character, among the various modes of human speech.

Their original words are probably monosyllabic, and the compounds have been formed, as circumstances required new terms.

Their distinction of animate and inanimate nature; their verbal adjectives and substantives; their want of genders; their tendency to combination and coalescence; the absence of all inflection in their verbs, to designate moods, time, number, or person; the want of all declensions in their substantives or adjectives; the paucity of connectives, and the consequent deficiency in precision; the absence of auxiliary verbs; the division of the pronouns, and the annexation of the temporal marks, partly to them and partly to the verbs, and the combination of the same marks with all the other parts of speech;—these prominent characteristics we have already stated and explained.

The order of arrangement in these languages is invariable, and necessarily so from their construction.

Definitives are little used, and we are not satisfied that the definitive article is at all known.* The numeral, *pazhik*, 'one,' in Chippewa, has been considered by some inquirers as an indefinite article; but we think it is used only when it has relation to number; as *one* man, when contradistinguished from none, or more than one, and not as *a* man, generally.

But a full consideration of this subject would carry us far beyond the limits we have prescribed for ourselves. Enough has been said to give a general view of some of the characteristic features of our Indian languages, and such a view is all we are able to offer, and perhaps more than our readers are willing to examine.

ART. IV.—*Hope Leslie; or Early Times in Massachusetts.*

By the Author of 'Redwood.' 2 vols. 12mo. New York. 1827.

WE hold it to be a fortunate thing for any country, that a portion of its literature should fall into the hands of the female sex; because their influence, in any walk of letters, is almost sure to be powerful and good. This influence appears to us to be so peculiar in its nature, and so important in its action, that we venture to demand the attention of our readers to some remarks upon it, however unworthy of the subject our exposition may be.

To speak first of the influence of female literature on females themselves, we presume that the mere fact of the existence of such a literature produces a very sensible effect on the mental character of those, whom, if it were only for gallantry's sake, we must call the best part of our race. A woman feels a laudable pride in the knowledge that a sister has distinguished herself in an intellectual career; has won a prize in the competition of mind; has vindicated for her sex that equality with the other, which has been both doubted and denied. Her success is an argument which can be wielded at pleasure, and doubtless with

* We make this remark, notwithstanding the effect, which the letter *k* is said, on page 390, to have upon the adjectives. We incline to think, that the translation there is too free to give a just notion of the idiomatic form of the language.